

JS-6

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

SANDRA MIRANDA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

THOMAS C. HOKINSON (in his
individual capacity); ARNOLD
NETKA (in his individual capacity);
ALFRED SOSA, (in his individual
capacity); CITY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF WATER AND
POWER, DOES 1 – 10,

Defendants.

CASE NO. **2:07-cv-00609-JHN –RCx**

*[Assigned for all purposes to Hon. District Judge
Jacqueline H. Nguyen and Magistrate Judge Rosalyn
Chapman]*

JUDGMENT ON JURY VERDICT

Trial Date: January 25, 2011

This action came on regularly for trial on January 25, 2011, in Courtroom 790 of the United States District Court, Honorable Jacqueline H. Nguyen, Judge Presiding; the plaintiff, Sandra Miranda, appearing by attorney Patricia J. Barry; defendants, Thomas C. Hokinson, Arnold E. Netka, and City of Los Angeles Department of Water of Power, appearing by attorney Paul N. Paquette; and defendant, Alfred Sosa, appearing by attorney Raymond J. Fuentes.

A jury of seven persons was regularly impaneled and sworn. Witnesses were sworn and testified. After hearing the evidence and the argument of counsel, the jury was duly instructed by the Court and the cause was submitted to the jury with

1 directions to return a verdict on special issues. The jury deliberated and thereafter
2 returned into Court on February 2, 2011, with its unanimous verdict as follows:

3 “Has plaintiff proven by a preponderance of the evidence that
4 she was subjected to any adverse employment action by one or
5 more of the defendants or their subordinates (a) at their
6 direction; or (b) that defendant set in motion a series of acts by
7 his subordinates that he knew or reasonably should have known
8 would cause the subordinate to deprive plaintiff of her rights; or
9 (c) that defendant knew or reasonably should have known that
10 his subordinates were engaging in these acts that deprived
11 plaintiff of her rights and defendant failed to act to prevent such
12 conduct?

13 Answer: No.”

14 It appearing by reason of said verdict that defendants are entitled to judgment
15 against plaintiff.

16 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED as
17 follows:

- 18 1. That plaintiff take nothing by way of her Complaint on file herein;
19 2. That judgment is entered in favor of defendants; and
20 3. That defendants shall recover their costs of suit herein.

21
22
23 DATED: February 14, 2011

By: 

JACQUELINE H. NGUYEN
Honorable District Court Judge

24
25
26
27 236647
28